AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY AUGUST 18, 2015 AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY JULY 7, 2015 AMENDED IN SENATE MAY 6, 2015 AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 15, 2015

SENATE BILL

No. 660

Introduced by Senators Leno and Hueso

February 27, 2015

An act to amend Sections 305, 307, 308, 309.6, 311, 1701.1, 1701.2, 1701.3, and 1701.4 of, and to add Sections 305.5, 1701.6, and 1701.7 to, the Public Utilities Code, relating to the Public Utilities Commission.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 660, as amended, Leno. Public Utilities Commission.

(1) The California Constitution establishes the Public Utilities Commission, with jurisdiction over all public utilities. The California Constitution grants the commission certain general powers over all public utilities, subject to control by the Legislature, and authorizes the Legislature, unlimited by the other provisions of the California Constitution, to confer additional authority and jurisdiction upon the commission that is cognate and germane to the regulation of public utilities. Existing law requires the Governor to designate the president of the commission from among its members and requires the president to direct the executive director, the attorney, and other staff of the commission, except for the Office of Ratepayer Advocates. Existing law authorizes the executive director and the attorney to undertake certain actions if directed or authorized by the president, except as otherwise directed or authorized by vote of the commission.

SB 660 —2—

This bill would repeal the requirement that the president direct the executive director, the attorney, and other commission staff. The bill would delete the authority of the president to direct or authorize the executive director and attorney to undertake certain actions, and would instead require that they be directed or authorized to undertake those actions by the commission. The bill would authorize the commission to delegate specific management and internal oversight functions to committees composed of 2 commissioners. The bill would require the commission to vote in an open meeting on the assignment or reassignment of proceeding to one or more commissioners.

(2) Existing law requires the commission, upon initiating a hearing, to assign one or more commissioners to oversee the case and an administrative law judge, where appropriate. Existing law requires the assigned commissioner to prepare and issue, by order or ruling, a scoping memo that describes the issues to be considered and the applicable timetable for resolution. Existing law requires the commission to adopt procedures on the disqualification of administrative law judges due to bias or prejudice similar to those of other state agencies and superior courts.

This bill would require the commission to additionally adopt procedures on disqualification of commissioners due to bias or prejudice similar to those of other state agencies and superior courts. For ratesetting or adjudicatory proceedings, the bill would require a commissioner or an administrative law judge to be disqualified if there is an appearance of bias or prejudice based on specified criteria. The bill would require that the commission procedures prohibit a commissioner or administrative law judge from ruling on a motion made by a party to a proceeding to disqualify the commissioner or administrative law judge due to bias or prejudice.

(3) The Public Utilities Act requires the commission to determine whether a proceeding requires a hearing and, if so, to determine whether the matter requires a quasi-legislative, an adjudication, or a ratesetting hearing. For these purposes, quasi-legislative cases are cases that establish policy rulemakings and investigations, which may establish rules affecting an entire industry, adjudication cases are enforcement cases and complaints, except those challenging the reasonableness of any rates or charges, and ratesetting cases are cases in which rates are established for a specific company, including general rate cases, performance-based ratemaking, and other ratesetting mechanisms. The act regulates communications in hearings before the commission and

-3- SB 660

defines "ex parte communication" to mean any oral or written communication between a decisionmaker and a person with an interest in a matter before the commission concerning substantive, but not procedural, issues that does not occur in a public hearing, workshop, or other public proceeding, or on the official record of the proceeding on the matter. Existing law defines "person with an interest" to mean, among other things, a person with a financial interest in a matter before the commission, or an agent or employee of the person with a financial interest, or a person receiving consideration for representing the person with a financial interest. Existing law requires the commission, by regulation, to adopt and publish a definition of the terms "decisionmaker" and "persons" for those purposes, along with any requirements for written reporting of ex parte communications and appropriate sanctions for noncompliance with any rule proscribing ex parte communications. The act provides that ex parte communications are prohibited in adjudication cases and are prohibited in ratesetting cases, with certain exceptions. The act requires that ex parte communications be permitted in quasi-legislative cases, without any restrictions. The commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure define a "decisionmaker" as any commissioner, the Chief Administrative Law Judge, any Assistant Chief Administrative Law Judge, the assigned administrative law judge, or the Law and Motion Administrative Law Judge. The Rules of Practice and Procedure provide that communications with a commissioner's personal advisors are subject to all of the restrictions on, and reporting requirements applicable to, ex parte communications, except that oral communications with an advisor in ratesetting proceedings are permitted without the restrictions.

This bill would delete the provision that an ex parte communication concerns a substantive, but not a procedural matter, and instead would provide that an ex parte communication concerns any matter that the commission has not specified in its Rules of Practice and Procedure as being a procedural matter. The bill would prohibit the commission from considering as a procedural matter communications between an interested person and a decisionmaker regarding which commissioner or administrative law judge may be assigned to a matter before the commission. The bill would define a person involved in issuing credit ratings or advising entities or persons who may invest in the shares or operations of any party to a proceeding as an interested person. The bill would require that the commission, by rule, adopt and publish a definition of decisionmakers, that would be required to include certain

SB 660 —4—

individuals in the commission. The bill would require decisionmakers to periodically report summary logs of ex parte communications with interested persons in compliance with rules established by the commission, and included in the commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, and would require the commission to post those summary logs on its Internet Web site.

This bill would require that a decisionmaker, in an adjudication or ratesetting case, who makes or receives a prohibited ex parte communication, or who receives an ex parte communication that was not timely reported, to disclose certain information regarding the communication in the record of the proceeding before the commission takes a vote on the matter. The bill would require the commission to render decisions based upon the record in a case and would provide that an ex parte communication not be part of the record of the proceeding.

This bill would provide that ex parte communications are permitted in quasi-legislative proceedings, but would require that they be reported within 3 working days of the communication by filing a "Notice of Ex Parte Communication" with the commission in accordance with procedures established by the commission for the service of that notice and containing specified information.

This bill would require the commission to additionally prohibit communications concerning procedural issues in adjudication cases between parties or persons with an interest and decisionmakers, except for the assigned administrative law judge.

Under existing law, the exceptions to the prohibition upon ex parte communications in ratesetting proceedings authorize a commissioner to permit oral ex parte communications if all interested parties are invited and given not less than 3 days' notice. If an ex parte communication meeting is granted to any party, it is required that all other parties also be granted individual ex parte meetings of a substantially equal period of time and that all parties be sent a notice of that authorization at the time the request is granted, at least 3 days prior to the meeting. The exceptions authorize a commissioner to permit written ex parte communications by any party provided that copies of the communication are transmitted to all parties.

This bill would delete the requirement that if an ex parte communication meeting is granted to any party in a ratesetting proceeding, that all other parties also be granted individual ex parte meetings of a substantially equal period of time and that all parties be _5_ SB 660

sent a notice of that authorization at the time the request is granted, at least 3 days prior to the meeting. The bill would prohibit oral communications concerning procedural matters in ratesetting cases between parties or persons with an interest and decisionmakers other than the assigned administrative law judge, except that a commissioner would be authorized to permit an oral communication relative to procedural matters if all interested parties are invited and given not less than 3 days' notice. The bill would prohibit written ex parte communications concerning procedural matters in ratesetting cases between parties or persons with an interest and decisionmakers other than the assigned administrative law judge, except that a commissioner would be authorized to permit a written communication relative to procedural issues by any party provided that copies of the communication are transmitted to all parties on the same day.

This bill would authorize the commission to impose civil sanctions, including civil penalties, on any entity or person, other than a decisionmaker or employee of the commission, that violates ex parte communication requirements. The bill would authorize the Attorney General to bring an enforcement action in the Superior Court of the City and County of San Francisco against a decisionmaker or employee of the commission who violates the ex parte communication requirements.

Under existing law, a violation of the Public Utilities Act or any order, decision, rule, direction, demand, or requirement of the commission is a crime.

Because the provisions of this bill would be a part of the act and because a violation of an order or decision of the commission implementing its requirements would be a crime, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program by expanding the application of a crime.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: yes.

SB 660 —6—

1 2

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 305 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:

- 305. The Governor shall designate a president of the commission from among the members of the commission. The president shall preside at all meetings and sessions of the commission.
- SEC. 2. Section 305.5 is added to the Public Utilities Code, to read:
 - 305.5. (a) The commission shall direct the executive director, the attorney, and other staff of the commission, except for the staff of the Office of Ratepayer Advocates described in Section 309.5, in performance of their duties.
 - (b) The commission may delegate specific management and internal oversight functions to committees composed of two commissioners. Committees shall meet regularly with staff and shall report to the commission for additional guidance or approval of decisions pertaining to the operations of the commission.
 - (c) The commission shall vote in an open meeting on the assignment or reassignment of any proceeding to one or more commissioners.
 - SEC. 3. Section 307 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:
 - 307. (a) The commission may appoint as attorney to the commission an attorney at law of this state, who shall hold office during the pleasure of the commission.
 - (b) The attorney shall represent and appear for the people of the State of California and the commission in all actions and proceedings involving any question under this part or under any order or act of the commission. If directed to do so by the commission, the attorney shall intervene, if possible, in any action or proceeding in which any such question is involved.
 - (c) The attorney shall commence, prosecute, and expedite the final determination of all actions and proceedings directed or authorized by the commission, advise the commission and each commissioner, when so requested, in regard to all matters in connection with the powers and duties of the commission and the members thereof, and generally perform all duties and services as

7 SB 660

1 attorney to the commission that the commission may require of 2 him or her.

- SEC. 4. Section 308 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:
- 308. (a) The commission shall appoint an executive director, who shall hold office during its pleasure. The executive director shall be responsible for the commission's executive and administrative duties and shall organize, coordinate, supervise, and direct the operations and affairs of the commission and expedite all matters within the commission's jurisdiction.
- (b) The executive director shall keep a full and true record of all proceedings of the commission, issue all necessary process, writs, warrants, and notices, and perform any other duties as the commission prescribes. The commission may authorize the executive director to dismiss complaints or applications when all parties are in agreement thereto, in accordance with rules that the commission may prescribe.
- (c) The commission may appoint assistant executive directors who may serve warrants and other process in any county or city and county of this state.
- SEC. 5. Section 309.6 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:
- 309.6. (a) The commission shall adopt procedures on the disqualification of commissioners and administrative law judges due to bias or prejudice similar to those of other state agencies and superior courts.
- (b) (1) For ratesetting and adjudicatory proceedings, a commissioner or administrative law judge shall be disqualified if there is an appearance of bias or prejudice based on any of the following:
 - (A) Actions taken during the proceeding.
- (B) Private communications before the commencement of the proceeding to influence the request for relief sought by any party to the proceeding.
- (C) Actions demonstrating any commitment to provide relief to a party.
- (2) Past work experience by the commissioner or administrative law judge shall not be a sufficient basis for demonstrating an appearance of bias or prejudice pursuant to paragraph (1).

SB 660 —8—

(c) The commission procedures shall prohibit a commissioner or administrative law judge from ruling on a motion made by a party to a proceeding to disqualify the commissioner or administrative law judge due to bias or prejudice.

- (d) The commission shall develop the procedures with the opportunity for public review and comment.
- SEC. 6. Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:
- 311. (a) The commission, each commissioner, the executive director, and the assistant executive directors may administer oaths, certify to all official acts, and issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses and the production of papers, waybills, books, accounts, documents, and testimony in any inquiry, investigation, hearing, or proceeding in any part of the state.
- (b) The administrative law judges may administer oaths, examine witnesses, issue subpoenas, and receive evidence, under rules that the commission adopts.
- (c) The evidence in any hearing shall be taken by the commissioner or the administrative law judge designated for that purpose. The commissioner or the administrative law judge may receive and exclude evidence offered in the hearing in accordance with the rules of practice and procedure of the commission.
- (d) Consistent with the procedures contained in Sections 1701.1, 1701.2, 1701.3, and 1701.4, the assigned commissioner or the administrative law judge shall prepare and file an opinion setting forth recommendations, findings, and conclusions. The opinion of the assigned commissioner or the administrative law judge is the proposed decision and a part of the public record in the proceeding. The proposed decision of the assigned commissioner or the administrative law judge shall be filed with the commission and served upon all parties to the action or proceeding without undue delay, not later than 90 days after the matter has been submitted for decision. The commission shall issue its decision not sooner than 30 days following filing and service of the proposed decision by the assigned commissioner or the administrative law judge, except that the 30-day period may be reduced or waived by the commission in an unforeseen emergency situation or upon the stipulation of all parties to the proceeding or as otherwise provided by law. The commission may, in issuing its decision, adopt, modify, or set aside the proposed decision or any

-9- SB 660

part of the decision. Where the modification is of a decision in an adjudicatory hearing it shall be based upon the evidence in the record. Every finding, opinion, and order made in the proposed decision and approved or confirmed by the commission shall, upon that approval or confirmation, be the finding, opinion, and order of the commission.

(e) (1) Any item appearing on the commission's public agenda as an alternate item to a proposed decision or to a decision subject to subdivision (g) shall be served upon all parties to the proceeding without undue delay and shall be subject to public review and comment before it may be voted upon. For purposes of this subdivision, "alternate" means either a substantive revision to a proposed decision that materially changes the resolution of a contested issue or any substantive addition to the findings of fact, conclusions of law, or ordering paragraphs. The commission shall adopt rules that provide for the time and manner of review and comment and the rescheduling of the item on a subsequent public agenda, except that the item may not be rescheduled for consideration sooner than 30 days following service of the alternative item upon all parties. The alternate item shall be accompanied by a digest that clearly explains the substantive revisions to the proposed decision. The commission's rules may provide that the time and manner of review and comment on an alternate item may be reduced or waived by the commission in an unforeseen emergency situation.

(2) In a proceeding in which both a proposed decision and an alternate have been served upon the parties and comments have been received on the proposed decision or alternate, or both, if substantive revisions are made to the proposed decision or alternate that was previously served upon the parties and made available for comment, the substantively revised proposed decision or substantively revised alternate shall be served upon all parties to the proceeding and shall be made publicly available on the commission's Internet Web site, noted on the docket sheet for the proceeding, for not less than five full working days prior to it being acted upon by the commission. Any party to the proceeding or interested member of the public may file comments with the commission addressing any substantively revised aspect of the proposed decision or alternate prior to it being acted upon by the commission.

SB 660 —10—

(f) The commission may specify that the administrative law judge assigned to a proceeding involving an electrical, gas, telephone, railroad, or water corporation, or a highway carrier, initiated by customer or subscriber complaint need not prepare, file, and serve an opinion, unless the commission finds that to do so is required in the public interest in a particular case.

- (g) (1) Prior to voting on any commission decision not subject to subdivision (d), the decision shall be served on parties and subject to at least 30 days public review and comment. Any alternate to any commission decision shall be subject to the same requirements as provided for alternate decisions under subdivision (e). For purposes of this subdivision, "decision" also includes resolutions, including resolutions on advice letter filings.
- (2) The 30-day period may be reduced or waived in an unforescen emergency situation, upon the stipulation of all parties in the proceeding, for an uncontested matter in which the decision grants the relief requested, or for an order seeking temporary injunctive relief.
- (3) This subdivision does not apply to uncontested matters that pertain solely to water corporations, or to orders instituting investigations or rulemakings, categorization resolutions under Sections 1701.1 to 1701.4, inclusive, or orders authorized by law to be considered in executive session. Consistent with regulatory efficiency and the need for adequate prior notice and comment on commission decisions, the commission may adopt rules, after notice and comment, establishing additional categories of decisions subject to waiver or reduction of the time period in this section.
- (h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amendments, revisions, or modifications by the commission of its Rules of Practice and Procedure, shall be submitted to the Office of Administrative Law for prior review in accordance with Sections 11349, 11349.3, 11349.4, 11349.5, 11349.6, and 11350.3 of, and subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 11349.1 of, the Government Code. If the commission adopts an emergency revision to its Rules of Practice and Procedure based upon a finding that the revision is necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health and safety, or general welfare, this emergency revision shall only be reviewed by the Office of Administrative Law in accordance with subdivisions (b) to (d), inclusive, of Section 11349.6 of the Government Code. The emergency revision shall become effective

-11- SB 660

upon filing with the Secretary of State and shall remain in effect for no more than 120 days. A petition for writ of review pursuant to Section 1756 of a commission decision amending, revising, or modifying its Rules of Practice and Procedure shall not be filed until the regulation has been approved by the Office of Administrative Law, the Governor, or a court pursuant to Section 11350.3 of the Government Code. If the period for filing the petition for writ of review would otherwise have already commenced under Section 1733 or 1756 at the time of that approval, then the period for filing the petition for writ of review shall continue until 30 days after the date of that approval. Nothing in this subdivision shall require the commission to comply with Article 5 (commencing with Section 11346) of Chapter 3.5 of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code. This subdivision is only intended to provide for the Office of Administrative Law review of procedural commission decisions relating to commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, and not general orders, resolutions, or other substantive regulations.

(i) The commission shall immediately notify the Legislature whenever the commission reduces or waives the time period for public review and comment due to an unforseen emergency situation, as provided in subdivision (d), (e), or (g).

SEC. 7.

- *SEC.* 6. Section 1701.1 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:
- 1701.1. (a) The commission, consistent with due process, public policy, and statutory requirements, shall determine whether a proceeding requires a hearing. The commission shall determine whether the matter requires a quasi-legislative, an adjudication, or a ratesetting hearing. The commission's decision as to the nature of the proceeding shall be subject to a request for rehearing within 10 days of the date of that decision. If that decision is not appealed to the commission within that time period it shall not be subsequently subject to judicial review. Only those parties who have requested a rehearing within that time period shall subsequently have standing for judicial review and that review shall only be available at the conclusion of the proceeding. The commission shall render its decision regarding the rehearing within 30 days. The commission shall establish rules regarding ex parte communication on case categorization issues.

SB 660 —12—

(b) The commission upon initiating a hearing shall assign one or more commissioners to oversee the case and an administrative law judge where appropriate. The assigned commissioner shall schedule a prehearing conference. The assigned commissioner shall prepare and issue by order or ruling a scoping memo that describes the issues to be considered and the applicable timetable for resolution.

- (c) (1) Quasi-legislative cases, for purposes of this article, are cases that establish policy, including, but not limited to, rulemakings and investigations which may establish rules affecting an entire industry.
- (2) Adjudication cases, for purposes of this article, are enforcement cases and complaints except those challenging the reasonableness of any rates or charges as specified in Section 1702.
- (3) Ratesetting cases, for purposes of this article, are cases in which rates are established for a specific company, including, but not limited to, general rate cases, performance-based ratemaking, and other ratesetting mechanisms.
- (d) (1) (A) "Ex parte communication," for purposes of this article, means any oral or written communication between a decisionmaker and an interested person concerning any matter that the commission has not specified in its Rules of Practice and Procedure as being a procedural matter and that does not occur in a public hearing, workshop, or other public proceeding, or on the official record of the proceeding on the matter. The commission shall specify in its Rules of Practice and Procedure, enacted by rulemaking, the types of communications considered procedural matters under this article. Any communication between an interested person and a decisionmaker regarding which commissioner or administrative law judge may be assigned to a matter before the commission shall not be deemed to be a procedural matter and shall be an ex parte communication subject to this article.
- (B) "Interested person," for purposes of this article, means any of the following:
- (i) Any applicant, an agent or an employee of the applicant, or a person receiving consideration for representing the applicant, or a party to the proceeding on any matter before the commission.
- (ii) Any person with a financial interest, as described in Article 1 (commencing with Section 87100) of Chapter 7 of Title 9 of the

-13- SB 660

Government Code, in a matter before the commission, or an agent or employee of the person with a financial interest, or a person receiving consideration for representing the person with a financial interest. A person involved in issuing credit ratings or advising entities or persons who may invest in the shares or operations of any party to a proceeding is a person with a financial interest.

- (iii) A representative acting on behalf of any civic, environmental, neighborhood, business, labor, trade, or similar organization who intends to influence the decision of a commission member on a matter before the commission.
- (iv) Other categories of individuals deemed by the commission, by rule, to be an interested person.
- (2) The commission shall by rule adopt and publish a definition of decisionmakers and interested persons for purposes of this section, along with any requirements for written reporting of ex parte communications and appropriate sanctions for noncompliance with any rule proscribing ex parte communications. The definition of decisionmakers shall include, but is not limited to, each commissioner; the attorney for the commission; the executive director of the commission; the personal staff of a commissioner if the staff is acting in a policy or legal advisory capacity; the Chief Administrative Law Judge of the commission; the administrative law judge assigned to the proceeding; and the director of the Energy Division, the director of the Communications Division, the director of the Water and Audits Division, and the director of the Safety and Enforcement Division, where those directors are acting in an advisory capacity in the proceeding.
- (3) For quasi-legislative cases, the rules shall provide that ex parte communications that are required to be reported shall be reported by the interested person, whether the communication was initiated by the interested person or the decisionmaker.
- (4) For quasi-legislative cases, ex parte communications shall be reported by an interested person within three working days of the communication by filing a "Notice of Ex Parte Communication" with the commission in accordance with the procedures established by the commission for the service of that notice. The notice shall include the following information:
- (A) The date, time, and location of the communication, whether it was oral, written, or a combination, and the communications medium utilized.

SB 660 —14—

(B) The person initiating the communication, including a decisionmaker, when applicable, and the identity of the recipient and any persons present during the communication.

- (C) A complete and comprehensive description of the interested person's and the decisionmaker's communication and its content, to which shall be attached a copy of any written material or text used during the communication.
- (5) For adjudication and ratesetting cases, the rules shall provide that if a prohibited ex parte communication occurs, whether initiated by a decisionmaker or an interested person, all of the following shall be required:
- (A) The interested person participating in the communication shall report the communication within one working day of the communication by filing a Notice of Prohibited Ex Parte Communication with the commission in accordance with the procedures established by the commission for the service of that notice. The notice shall include the information required by paragraph (4).
- (B) A decisionmaker who participated in the prohibited communication shall comply with both of the following:
- (i) If the interested person who participated in the communication has not timely submitted the Notice of Prohibited Ex Parte Communication required by subparagraph (A), the decisionmaker shall promptly prepare and file a "Decisionmaker's Notice of Prohibited Ex Parte Communication" with the commission in accordance with the procedures established by the commission for the service of that notice. The notice shall include the information required by paragraph (4).
- (ii) If the interested person has timely submitted the Notice of Prohibited Ex Parte Communication required by subparagraph (A), the decisionmaker shall review the interested person's submitted notice. If the decisionmaker believes that the interested person's submitted notice is not accurate or does not meet the requirements of paragraph (4), the decisionmaker shall promptly file a notice that corrects or supplements the interested person's submitted notice in accordance with the procedures established by the commission for the service of that notice. If the decisionmaker believes that the interested person's submitted notice is accurate and meets the requirements of paragraph (4), the decisionmaker shall promptly file a notice that indicates his or her concurrence

-15- SB 660

with the interested person's submitted notice in accordance with the procedures established by the commission.

- (6) The commission shall not take any vote on a matter to which a prohibited ex parte communication is known to have occurred until the notices required by this subdivision have been made and all parties to the proceeding have been provided a reasonable opportunity to respond to the prohibited ex parte communication.
- (7) If the prohibited ex parte communication is not disclosed as required by this subdivision until after the commission has issued a decision on the matter to which the prohibited communication pertained, the commission shall provide a reasonable time for a party to file a petition to rescind or modify the decision. The commission shall process the petition in accordance with the commission's procedures for petitions for modification and shall issue a decision on the petition no later than 180 days after the filing of the petition.
- (8) A decisionmaker shall periodically report summary logs of ex parte communications with interested persons in compliance with rules established by the commission to be included in its Rules of Practice and Procedure. The commission shall post the summary logs on its Internet Web site. A summary log, at a minimum, shall include information required in paragraph (3) and in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) and the relevant proceedings discussed. If a decisionmaker believes that a Notice of Ex Parte Communication submitted by an interested person in a quasi-legislative case is inaccurate or fails to meet the requirements of paragraphs (3) and (4), the decisionmaker may include corrected or supplemental information in the summary log and shall also provide notice of any corrected or supplemental information in the proceeding to which it pertains in accordance with the procedures established by the commission for the service of that information. The commission shall enable the posting of summary logs on its Internet Web site not later than July 1, 2016.
- (9) (A) Ex parte communications that occur at conferences, including open session communications, shall be governed by the provisions of this article and any rules adopted by the commission pursuant to this article.
- (B) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the commission may adopt rules for inclusion in the commission's Rules of Practice

SB 660 —16—

and Procedure specific to open session communications if the rules do both of the following:

- (i) Open session communications relating to a pending adjudication case or a pending ratesetting case shall be prohibited.
- (ii) Open session communications relating to a pending quasi-legislative case may be permitted if the commission's rules require that permitted open session communications are promptly disclosed in the proceeding to which the communication relates and require that parties to the proceeding are allowed a reasonable opportunity to respond to the communication before the commission may vote on any matter to which the communication pertained.
- (C) For purposes of this section, "open session communication" means an ex parte communication made in a speech, comment, or writing delivered to all attendees of a noticed session of a conference. All other ex parte communications at a conference, including, but not limited to, communications in a private setting or during meals, entertainment events, tours, and informal discussions among conference attendees, are not included in the definition of open session communication.
- (10) The commission shall render its decisions based on the evidence in the record. Ex parte communications shall not be a part of the record of the proceedings.

SEC. 8.

- *SEC.* 7. Section 1701.2 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:
- 1701.2. (a) If the commission pursuant to Section 1701.1 has determined that an adjudication case requires a hearing, the procedures prescribed by this section shall be applicable. The assigned commissioner or the assigned administrative law judge shall hear the case in the manner described in the scoping memo. The scoping memo shall designate whether the assigned commissioner or the assigned administrative law judge shall preside in the case. The commission shall provide by rule for peremptory challenges and challenges for cause of the administrative law judge. Challenges for cause shall include, but not be limited to, financial interests and prejudice. The rule shall provide that all parties are entitled to one peremptory challenge of the assignment of the administrative law judge in all cases. All parties are entitled to unlimited peremptory challenges in any case in which the

17 SB 660

administrative law judge has within the previous 12 months served in any capacity in an advocacy position at the commission, been employed by a regulated public utility, or has represented a party or has been an interested person in the case. The assigned commissioner or the administrative law judge shall prepare and file a decision setting forth recommendations, findings, and conclusions. The decision shall be filed with the commission and served upon all parties to the action or proceeding without undue delay, not later than 60 days after the matter has been submitted for decision. The decision of the assigned commissioner or the administrative law judge shall become the decision of the commission if no further action is taken within 30 days. Any party may appeal the decision to the commission, provided that the appeal is made within 30 days of the issuance of the decision. The commission may itself initiate a review of the proposed decision on any grounds. The commission decision shall be based on the record developed by the assigned commissioner or the administrative law judge. A decision different from that of the assigned commissioner or the administrative law judge shall be accompanied by a written explanation of each of the changes made to the decision.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

(b) Notwithstanding Section 307, an officer, employee, or agent of the commission that is personally involved in the prosecution or in the supervision of the prosecution of an adjudication case before the commission shall not participate in the decision of the case, or in the decision of any factually related adjudicatory proceeding, including participation in or advising the commission as to findings of fact, conclusions of law, or orders. An officer, employee, or agent of the commission that is personally involved in the prosecution or in the supervision of the prosecution of an adjudication case may participate in reaching a settlement of the case, but shall not participate in the decision of the commission to accept or reject the settlement, except as a witness or counsel in an open hearing or a hearing closed pursuant to subdivision (d). The Legislature finds that the commission performs both prosecutorial and adjudicatory functions in an adjudication case and declares its intent that an officer, employee, or agent of the commission, including its attorneys, may perform only one of those functions in any adjudication case or factually related adjudicatory proceeding.

SB 660 — 18 —

(c) (1) Ex parte communications shall be prohibited in adjudication cases.

- (2) Any oral or written communications concerning procedural matters in adjudication cases between interested persons and decisionmakers, except the assigned administrative law judge, shall be prohibited.
- (d) Notwithstanding any other law, the commission may meet in a closed hearing to consider the decision that is being appealed. The vote on the appeal shall be in a public meeting and shall be accompanied with an explanation of the appeal decision.
- (e) Adjudication cases shall be resolved within 12 months of initiation unless the commission makes findings why that deadline cannot be met and issues an order extending that deadline. In the event that a rehearing of an adjudication case is granted, the parties shall have an opportunity for final oral argument.
- (f) (1) The commission may determine that the respondent lacks, or may lack, the ability to pay potential penalties or fines or to pay restitution that may be ordered by the commission.
- (2) If the commission determines that a respondent lacks, or may lack, the ability to pay, the commission may order the respondent to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the commission, sufficient ability to pay potential penalties, fines, or restitution that may be ordered by the commission. The respondent shall demonstrate the ability to pay, or make other financial arrangements satisfactory to the commission, within seven days of the commission commencing an adjudication case. The commission may delegate to the attorney to the commission the determination of whether a sufficient showing has been made by the respondent of an ability to pay.
- (3) Within seven days of the commission's determination of the respondent's ability to pay potential penalties, fines, or restitution, the respondent shall be entitled to an impartial review by an administrative law judge of the sufficiency of the showing made by the respondent of the respondent's ability to pay. The review by an administrative law judge of the ability of the respondent to pay shall become part of the record of the adjudication and is subject to the commission's consideration in its order resolving the adjudication case. The administrative law judge may enter temporary orders modifying any financial requirement made of the respondent pending the review by the administrative law judge.

-19- SB 660

(4) A respondent that is a public utility regulated under a rate of return or rate of margin regulatory structure or that has gross annual revenues of more than one hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) generated within California is presumed to be able to pay potential penalties or fines or to pay restitution that may be ordered by the commission, and, therefore, paragraphs (1) to (3), inclusive, do not apply to that respondent.

SEC. 9.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39

40

SEC. 8. Section 1701.3 of the Public Utilities Code is amended to read:

1701.3. (a) If the commission pursuant to Section 1701.1 has determined that a ratesetting case requires a hearing, the procedures prescribed by this section shall be applicable. The assigned commissioner shall determine prior to the first hearing whether the commissioner or the assigned administrative law judge shall be designated as the principal hearing officer. The principal hearing officer shall be present for more than one-half of the hearing days. The decision of the principal hearing officer shall be the proposed decision. An alternate decision may be issued by the assigned commissioner or the assigned administrative law judge who is not the principal hearing officer. The commission shall establish a procedure for any party to request the presence of a commissioner at a hearing. The assigned commissioner shall be present at the closing arguments of the case. The principal hearing officer shall present the proposed decision to the full commission in a public meeting. The alternate decision, if any, shall also be presented to the full commission at that public meeting. The alternate decision shall be filed with the commission and shall be served on all parties simultaneously with the proposed decision.

The presentation to the full commission shall contain a record of the number of days of the hearing, the number of days that each commissioner was present, and whether the decision was completed on time.

(b) The commission shall provide by regulation for peremptory challenges and challenges for cause of the administrative law judge. Challenges for cause shall include, but not be limited to, financial interests and prejudice. All parties shall be entitled to unlimited peremptory challenges in any case in which the administrative law judge has within the previous 12 months served in any capacity in an advocacy position at the commission, been employed by a

— 20 — SB 660

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

regulated public utility, or has represented a party or has been an interested person in the case.

- (c) (1) Ex parte communications are prohibited in ratesetting cases.
- (A) Oral communications may be permitted without any reporting obligation at any time by any decisionmaker if all parties are invited and given not less than three working days' notice.
- (B) Written ex parte communications by any interested person may be permitted without any reporting requirement provided that copies of the communication are transmitted to all parties on the same day as the original communication. Written ex parte communications shall not be part of the record of the proceeding.
- (2) Oral communications concerning a procedural matter in ratesetting cases between interested persons and decisionmakers, except the assigned administrative law judge, are prohibited, except that an oral communication may be permitted at any time by any decisionmaker if all parties are invited and given not less than three working days' notice.
- (3) Written communications concerning a procedural matter in ratesetting cases between interested persons and decisionmakers, except the assigned administrative law judge, are prohibited, except that a decisionmaker may permit a written communication by any party if copies of the communication are transmitted to all parties on the same day.
- (d) Any party has the right to present a final oral argument of its case before the commission. Those requests shall be scheduled in a timely manner. A quorum of the commission shall be present for the final oral arguments.
- (e) The commission may, in issuing its decision, adopt, modify, or set aside the proposed decision or any part of the decision based on evidence in the record. The final decision of the commission shall be issued not later than 60 days after the issuance of the proposed decision. Under extraordinary circumstances the commission may extend this date for a reasonable period. The 60-day period shall be extended for 30 days if any alternate decision is proposed pursuant to Section 311.

SEC. 10.

SEC. 9. Section 1701.4 of the Public Utilities Code is amended 39 to read:

—21— SB 660

1701.4. (a) If the commission pursuant to Section 1701.1 has determined that a quasi-legislative case requires a hearing, the procedures prescribed by this section shall be applicable. The assigned administrative law judge shall act as an assistant to the assigned commissioner in quasi-legislative cases. The assigned commissioner shall be present for formal hearings. The assigned commissioner shall prepare the proposed rule or order with the assistance of the administrative law judge. The assigned commissioner shall present the proposed rule or order to the full commission in a public meeting. The report shall include the number of days of hearing and the number of days that the commissioner was present.

- (b) Ex parte communications shall be permitted. Any ex parte communication shall be reported by an interested person in accordance with subdivision (d) of Section 1701.1 and the procedures established by the commission for the service of that notice. No reporting shall be required for written ex parte communications that are transmitted to all parties on the same day as the original communication.
- (c) Any party has the right to present a final oral argument of its case before the commission. Those requests shall be scheduled in a timely manner. A quorum of the commission shall be present for the final oral arguments.
- (d) The commission may, in issuing its rule or order, adopt, modify, or set aside the proposed decision or any part of the rule or order. The final rule or order of the commission shall be issued not later than 60 days after the issuance of the proposed rule or order. Under extraordinary circumstances the commission may extend this date for a reasonable period. The 60-day period shall be extended for 30 days if any alternate rule or order is proposed pursuant to Section 311.

SEC. 11.

SEC. 10. Section 1701.6 is added to the Public Utilities Code, to read:

1701.6. (a) In addition to any penalty, fine, or other punishment applicable pursuant to Article 11 (commencing with Section 2100), the commission may assess civil sanctions upon any entity or person, other than a decisionmaker or employee of the commission, who violates, fails to comply with, or procures, aids, or abets any violation of, the ex parte communication requirements of this

SB 660 — 22 —

1 article or those adopted by the commission pursuant to this article.
2 The civil sanctions may include civil penalties, adverse
3 consequences in commission proceedings, or other appropriate
4 commission orders directed at the entity, person, or both the entity
5 and person, committing the violation.

- (b) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a civil penalty assessed shall not exceed fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) per violation. Each day of a continuing violation is a separate violation. If the violation consists of engaging in a communication that is prohibited by the ex parte communication requirements, each day that the violation is not disclosed to the commission and to parties of record in the formal proceeding in which the communication occurred shall constitute a separate violation. If the violation consists of failing to file a required notice of a permissible ex parte communication or filing a notice of a permissible ex parte communication that is inaccurate or incomplete, each day that the violation is not remedied shall constitute a separate violation.
- (2) If the entity or person may obtain, by violating the ex parte communication requirements, financial benefits that exceed the maximum amount of civil penalty allowable pursuant to paragraph (1), the commission may impose a civil penalty up to the amount of those financial benefits.
- (c) Civil penalties assessed pursuant to subdivision (b) upon entities whose rates are determined by the commission shall be in the form of credits to the customers of that entity. Civil penalties collected from other entities shall be deposited in the General Fund.
- (d) In determining the appropriate civil sanctions, the commission shall consider the following factors:
 - (1) The severity of the violation.
- (2) The conduct of the entity or person, including the level of experience of the entity or person in participating in commission proceedings.
 - (3) The financial resources of the entity or person.
- 34 (4) The totality of the circumstances in furtherance of the public 35 interest.
- 36 SEC. 12.
- 37 SEC. 11. Section 1701.7 is added to the Public Utilities Code, 38 to read:
- 39 1701.7. (a) The Attorney General may bring an enforcement 40 action in the Superior Court for the City and County of San

SB 660

Francisco against a decisionmaker or employee of the commission who violates, fails to comply with, or procures, aids, or abets any violation of, the ex parte communication requirements in this article or those adopted by the commission pursuant to this article. The court shall expedite its review of the action to provide effective and timely relief.

- (b) (1) Notwithstanding Section 1759, in an enforcement action brought pursuant to this section, the court may grant appropriate relief, including disqualification of the decisionmaker from one or more proceedings and civil penalties not to exceed fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) for each violation.
- (2) If the decisionmaker or employee may obtain, by violating the ex parte communication requirements, financial benefits that exceed the civil penalties provided in paragraph (1), the court may impose a civil penalty up to the amount of those financial benefits.
- (c) In determining the appropriate relief, the court may consider the following factors:
 - (1) The severity of the violation.
- (2) The conduct of the decisionmaker or employee, including whether the decisionmaker or employee knowingly violated the ex parte communication requirements.
 - (3) The financial resources of the decisionmaker or employee.
- (4) The totality of the circumstances in furtherance of the public interest.
- (d) The Attorney General may compromise the enforcement action subject to approval by the court.
- (e) Civil penalties collected pursuant to this section shall be deposited into the Litigation Deposits Fund established pursuant to Article 9 (commencing with Section 16425) of Chapter 2 of Part 2 of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

SEC. 13.

SEC. 12. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIIIB of the California Constitution because the only costs that may be incurred by a local agency or school district will be incurred because this act creates a new crime or infraction, eliminates a crime or infraction, or changes the penalty for a crime or infraction, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code, or changes the definition of a crime within

SB 660 — 24 —

- 1 the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIIIB of the California
- 2 Constitution.